Universal Religion.

OCTOBER, 1905.

CONTRIBUTORS.

UNITED STATES

DAVID STARR JORDAN, LL. D.
Stanford University, Cal.
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Boston
RABBI CHARLES FLEISCHER, Boston
JAMES H. WEST, Boston.
CHARLES FERGUSON, Kansas City.
JOHN W. ROBERTS, Fox Lake, Wis.
N. H. NESBITT, Tacoma, Wash.

FOREIGN

PROF. OTTO PFLEIDERER, D. D.,
University of Berlin, Germany
REV. CHARLES VOYSEY, M. A.
Theistic Church, London
HON. TOKIWO YOKOI, Tokio, Japan
REV. CHARLES STRONG, D. D.,
The Australian Church, Melbourne
W. D. LESUEUR, LL. D., Ottawa, Can.

SOME THOUGHTS ON PRAYER.

Charles Voysey, M. A.

We may unhesitatingly declare that it is absolutely of no use to try by prayer to change the will and purpose of God. It is not only useless to do this, but it is wrong and impious, and such prayer could never be offered from a truly religious and God-loving heart. If I thought that by any prayer of mine, either on my own behalf, or for those I love best on earth, I could turn God's purpose or change His mind and will in the slightest possible degree, I would surely never pray to Him again. Nor do I ever in my deepest anxiety for those I love ask Him for anything I think needful, without at the same moment wishing and praying also that His will may be done. The answer to the objection then can only be: You are perfectly right. It is of no use to pray to God to avert a calamity or even a crime which in His infinite wisdom and love He will not prevent.

There are instances among the most deeply religious of the attainment of so high a degree of spirituality, of cloudless trust in the wisdom and love of God that the soul has no desire, no longing, after temporal good or protection from ma-

terial injuries; cannot even pray to God to avert grief or injury from beloved ones, so perfect is the trust in His ceaseless watchfulness and care; so perfect is the conviction that nothing can ever happen without His wise and loving consent. The lips are closed because the heart is satisfied and is not conscious of a desire to ask God to interfere to grant a boon or to avert a calamity. And to give more force to what I say, I can confirm it by my own experience. Some forty-three years ago, as I well remember, my infant babe was for many hours lying on my knee, breathing out its slender life in gasps and sighs, its dear little eyes open all the while and fixed upon mine in responsive sympathy with my tears and perhaps wondering that I had nothing to give it for its comfort and help but my fatherly love. And all those hours my thoughts were with God and instead of praying to Him to spare my child or to shorten the pains of death, my heart was filled with only the one thought of His presence, His love and His sympathy. Over and over again I repeated "Thou God seest me," "Thou God seest us," "Thou, my God, knowest." This was enough to give me strength to bear the agony. And when I saw that it was God's will that the child should die, I never so much as dreamed of praying to Him to spare its life or to ease its pain or my own. But it is not given to everyone to reach this summit of peaceful trust in God, nor to any of us to feel it equally at all times of our lives.

There is a childlike use of prayer and a childish one, and they are not the same. The childish one is the desire to change our Father's will, to get Him to give us what He does not wish to grant, or to avert from us what He wishes us to suffer. All we want is to get our own way. This is an exhibition of the most childish ignorance of our Father's wisdom, our Father's love; childish ignorance of what is best for us. Still more childish, if possible, was the old notion of prayer which crops out in texts like these: "Ask and it shall be given you." "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name that shall ye receive," "The effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth most. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain, and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six

months, and he prayed again and the heaven gave rain and the earth brought forth her fruit.'' These are specimens of childish prayer still practiced by the sect called the ''Peculiar People,'' who, instead of calling in medical aid for their sick, ''call for the Elders of the Church to pray over them and anoint them with oil in the Name of the Lord.'' It is also found among some Christians who do not go to that extreme, but who pray to God to change His mind and are woefully disconcerted, depressed and even angry with God when they find that their prayers are vain.

But the childlike prayer is a very different kind. It is feeling and acting towards God as a trustful child feels and acts towards a loving father or mother on earth. It is a natural and reasonable exercise of a childlike instinct to betake itself to the Divine fatherly love and sympathy on every occasion of the need of help, guidance, or consolation. It is only natural while we are children to betake ourselves in weakness, ignorance or distress to the dearest friend on earth; so it is quite natural, but more wise, to betake ourselves, when we are up-grown, to our Divine Father, our best, wisest and most loving of friends, and pour out all our wants before Him. For however old we are, we are still but little children of our Father God. But the childlike prayer in all these occasions is a trustful prayer, not at all an assurance that God will give us what we want, but that He will only do what is supremely best for us.

I believe God delights in the prayers of His children, when they are childlike and not childish, because those prayers rivet afresh the tie which binds us to Himself and help us to cling to Him while He is embracing us in His Everlasting Arms.

THE SANITY OF LIFE.

Rev. Oscar T. Morgan, Ph. D.

Are the conditions in which men find themselves the result of mere accident? In the realm of human life is the law of cause and effect annulled? Are the fates really blind? Does brute force, either of brawn or of brain, hold the scepter over

all the position of power and influence in the world? Such questions, in some form, inevitably arise in the minds of men, and too often they are answered in the affirmative. If there is not presiding over the affairs of the universe a mind of consistent and moral purpose that treats man not merely according to his deserts but even more according to his needs, there is indeed reason to despair of life and to cease to strive after the good and true. Instead of indulging in an argument of our own, let us seek the answer which one of the master minds of the world would give to these considerations. Shakespeare in the well-known passage of his play, "Julius Caesar," declares:

> "Men at some time are masters of their fate:
> The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> But in ourselves, that we are underlings."

This is but one of many passages in which Shakespeare presses home the truth that each man is responsible for his condition in life. Life is not made up of a series of accidents. There is not some blind fate urging men on to their own destruction, as in the plays of Aeschylus; nor some avenging Nemesis meting out punishment according to its own arbitrary decree. Man is free to will and he is free to act, and the reward of his actions is fixed and invariable. It is true that sin may destroy the will and control the actions; but in his true nature man is free. As Mazzini says: "In Shakespeare * * * * liberty does exist. The act of a single day, or it may be of a single hour, has thrown an entire life under the spell of necessity; but in that day or hour, the man was free, and arbiter of his own future." The control of life and the determination of destiny are found with each individual. Conduct does not so much fix character as character determines conduct. Man is sovereign in the realm of human life. Our lives are what we make them. The laws that determine whether we shall succeed or fail may be more subtle and varied but they are just as fixed and uniform in their workings as the law of gravity. Just to the extent that the life within and the life without are brought into harmony does man have success and happiness. To have an eye that can see and a hand trained to seize the opportunities as they come is the best equipment for life.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which taken at its flood leads on to fortune."

The tide does not produce the fortune. That waits for the man who knows how to take advantage of the tide. The ordinary view of the world concerning character and fortune is well represented by Edmund in King Lear: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, —often the surfeit of our own behavior,—we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: as if we were villains by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by enforced obedience of planetary influence; and all that we are evil in, by divine thrusting on: an admirable evasion of sinful man to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star."

Shakespeare's disreputable characters take this view of life; as Gloucester: "As flies to wanton boys, are we to the gods; they kill us for their sport." So even Kent in his despair cries out: "It is the stars, the stars above us govern our condition."

It is an interesting fact that the plots of all Shakespeare's plays are internal, that is they are based on character. Not outward conditions, but the characters of the actors determine the issue. Sometimes the starting point of the play is very improbable, or even almost impossible; but grant these primary conditions, and the subsequent entanglements follow naturally enough. For example, in the "Comedy of Errors" it is hardly likely that two such pairs of twins, so exactly alike, ever existed. But grant this condition, and the further complications are perfectly natural. So it is in King Lear. If he could be so cruel and unnatural a father as to treat his daughter Cordelia as he did, it is not merely the irony of fate; but both just and natural that Regan and Goneril, who had inherited their father's cruel disposition, should turn him out into the night and storm. Even the supernatural element in Macbeth is largely subjective. The bloody consciences of the murderers stain their hands, and their guilty imaginations call up the souls of those they have murdered. The very fires of hell were

kindled within their souls by their avenging consciences. Like Milton's fallen angel, they could say, "Myself am hell."

Hamlet, the man of thought, suddenly called to be a man of action, very naturally failed. His fine sensibility, yoked to his thorough inefficiency, caused him to see his father's ghost, drove Ophelia to her death, and furnished the whole motive power of the whole play. His plaint is:

> "The times are out of joint: accursed spite
> That ever I was born to set them right."

The real fact is that not the times but Hamlet himself was out of joint. He was not equipped to face the world as it is, but only as he thought it ought to be. He was too much "sicklied o'er with the pale hue of thought." So it is through the whole round of Shakespeare's plays. Every thing follows in the most natural and necessary way. There are no accidents to change the course of events. It is a weakness of Euripides, to which even Homer was subject, that when the situation became too complicated, a god swooped down and relieved the difficulties by carrying away one of the heroes. With their views of nature and man this was artistically permissable; but the modern penny-a-liners have no such defense, and yet they follow the same method. A distant relative dies in the nick of time and leaves a fortune to the hero, a long lost son returns and crowns his parents' old age with riches and blessings, a team runs away and gives the poor, brave young man an opportunity to get into the good graces of the rich man who has the beautiful daughter.

Which of these modes of representation is true to life? Is there sanity or insanity shown in the conduct of the universe? Is life made up of a series of accidents? It was no accident that the steam lifted the lid of the tea kettle before the eyes of Watts. The apple which Newton saw fall to the ground was not the first apple that had ever fallen. Seeming accidents are but the opportunities which ability seizes and makes use of. The man with the seeing eye and the trained hand always has and ever will be a leader in the material world, and the man of open vision and devotion to the truth will ever be a prophet in the world of spirit.

FOILS.

James H. West.

I.

"I am the master of my fate," one says,
  And adds, "I am the captain of my soul."
Bravely a man rehearsed these words, in days
  When he was young and fortunate and whole.
From virtuous ancestry his blood was calm;
  Sisters and brdothers—friends—were his a store;
Thorns were afar from him, and pine and palm
Fragrantly breathed for him on summer shore.
Fate took his wealth; a sister died in shame:
  Honor he scoffed at when his pride was bled.
One loved him still, and would have borne his name,
  But while she donned the orange-blooms he fled.
A new face shone while pealed his marriage-bell:
It beckoned—and he followed it to hell.

II.

"Why should I strive! What boon can I attain!
  Fate had conditioned me ere I was born!"
Such were the manacles of damning pain
  Another life from earliest years had worn.
His mother was a woman of the street,
  His "father"—she nor he had ever known;
The alleys were his nursery, and sweet
  To him as to a dog a wayside bone.
His country called—ah, here was chance to die!
  He flew on savage wings and met the foe.
His victory gave him courage, and his eye
  Sparkled with hope the noble only know.
Back to the world he came, and toiled elate,
And died an honored Minister of State.

NATURAL SELECTION ON THE MORAL PLANE.

Alfred W. Martin.

The supreme contribution of Darwin to modern knowledge was his explanation of the verified truth of evolution. He accounted for it in terms of "natural selection." All organisms that comply with the conditions of victory in the struggle for existence, Nature selects for survival, and only these. She makes survival conditional upon successful adjustment to environment. Spencer gave terse expression to Darwin's discovery in the phrase "Survival of the fittest," a phrase that by many readers has been much misunderstood. Darwin demonstrated the operation of this selective process by the most remarkable mass of evidence the world has ever seen and he presented it all with a candor, sincerity and consecrated passion for truth, rarely equalled and never surpassed. Incidentally the significant fact should be noted that forty-six years of criticism and extended observation of Nature's facts have but strengthened the theory which made the "Origin of Species" an epoch-making book. In showing forth the principle of natural selection Darwin took his illustrations for the most part from the physical plane and in consequence the notion has obtained that the principle has no application on the mental and moral planes, that survival is in no way dependent upon intellectual or ethical conditions, that Nature in her selecting is indifferent to the moral life, that conscience, virtue, obedience to the moral law are not taken into the account when natural selection is at work. To expose the fallacy of this popular notion, to show the part played by morality in the evolution of man is the aim of this discourse.

Who are the fittest? Is it they who are superior in point of physical strength? Not always. In that remote age when the struggle for existence was on between the beasts and man just evolved from brutedom, in that battle for survival man was no match physically for his antagonist. It was his intelligence that made him fittest to survive. With that intelligence he shaped a club and a spear, manufactured the bow and arrow, invented a gun, and as a result he was victorious.

Nature, therefore, takes account of mental capacity as well as of physical strength. Similarly in the conflict of man with man, as the present Oriental war shows, bodily advantages of height and girth count for very little as compared with mental prowess. 'Tis not the army with the biggest and brawniest, but with the brainiest men, with the ablest generals and the most improved methods and modes of warfare that wins.

Nature, then, is on the side of intellect as well as on that of physique in the struggle for life. Is she also on the side of morality or does she let the good and bad thrive equally well? This, indeed, is what many people suppose. They think their sin is their own affair, that nothing outside them takes cognizance of their evil and that no serious consequences can follow from it. But they are grievously in error and the "Descent of Man," following the "Origin of Species," has no higher value than that it brings to light the fact that Nature is "against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the face of the earth." Far from being on the side of immorality or even on the side of indifference, Nature is on the side of virtue, taking full account of moral qualities in her selecting process, allowing no race deficient in moral fibre to triumph over another that has it, and of two races with moral standards, letting the higher one determine the question of survival. In other words, Darwin disposes of the popular idea that Nature takes no account of morality, but allows the good and bad to fare equally well. He shows that Nature makes morality a condition, a test of fitness to survive in the struggle for life. A few illustrations will serve to make plain and indubitable the truth that Nature is not on the side of immorality, not indifferent, but exclusively on the side of virtue and positively against all forms of moral evil.

1. Nature is against intemperance. Most men who indulge their appetite for spirituous liquors are apt to think that it is entirely their own affair, that nothing outside of them takes note of their excess, that no grievous results will follow. But Nature thinks differently. She disorders his system and cuts short his days. No temperance statistics are so impressive as those English tables of which Darwin made use, showing that people who are intemperate at thirty have but

thirteen more years to live and usually less than thirteen. Those of us who have seen the lamented Jefferson in "Rip Van Winkle" recognized the truthfulness to human nature in the weak and vacillating will of the jovial old drinker, but the results as depicted in the play are false to the way in which Nature deals with intemperance, besides conveying an anti-moral lesson. Each time that his appetite got the better of his judgment and his conscience Rip affirmed, "I won't count this one." Well, he may not count it and a kindly company of friends may not count it, but Nature counted it just the same. Down there in the cells of his body Nature registered each successive drink, undermining his constitution and reducing his normal term of life. In the struggle for life Nature is on the side of temperance and self control.

2. Nature is against the social evil, against the dissolute, licentious life. The man who has no reverence for the family relation, or who disregards the sanctity of the marriage bond may think it wholly his own affair making no difference in any way whether or not he leads an immoral life. But not so Nature. She is against profligacy whether in men or in women, for the offspring of the former she exterminates, slowly it may be, but with unfailing certainty, while profligate women have but few years to live and are allowed to have very few if any children. As for those who commit the sin of self-abuse, is Nature indifferent to their crime? Nay, for she first of all weakens them in body, then in mind, depriving them of memory, making them childish, idiotic and sterile besides. Nature has, as it were, a loathing of the whole tribe of profligates and the sinners in secret and solitude; she will not suffer them to thrive or fare as do the chaste and self-controlled.

3. Nature is against heartlessness, inhumanity, disregard for the welfare of the unfortunate, the suffering, the weak. There are those who construe Darwinism to mean that all who are physically defective so as to be unable to take care of themselves ought to die and that philanthropy applied to such is a mistake since it tends to keep alive those who have no right to live. But such a conception of Darwinism is both crude and false, for Darwin teaches that individuals and whole races that act on this principle of practical heartlessness tend

to their own destruction. He cites instances of peoples that behaved thus toward their weaker brethren and remarks that the significant fact concerning these inhuman tribes is that they did not survive in the struggle for life. To kill off the physically unfit, and close our hospitals and asylums would mean not an advance but a retrogression in civilization. Darwin demonstrates the truth that to dry up the springs of pity, sympathy, helpful service for the unfortunate, would involve a reversal of the long, slow process by which civilization has been reached, a positive retrogression of the surviving strong to barbarism. And what is here true of inhumanity of man to man is equally true of cruelty to animals. "Inhumanity to brutes, said President Hyde of Bowdoin college, brutalizes humanity." Such is Nature's way of setting the seal of her disapproval on want of heart in the treatment of the creatures beneath us. Nature hardens still more the hard heart that persists in perpetrating cruelty on dumb animals and on the other hand she increases the capacity for sympathy and love in the hearts of those who practice kindliness and gentleness in their treatment of animal life.

So again, with reference to the sentiment of civic patriotism or public spirit Nature is against them that are deficient therein and on the side of this social virtue. Coherence, stability, strength and permanence she gives only to those communities in which zeal for public welfare supplements zeal for individual and family welfare. Darwin successfully appeals to history in his search for illustrations of this truth, showing that the unsocial community goes down before the people in whom the social consciousness has been developed. Similarly in the conflict of two nations, the possession of a social consciousness becomes a powerful factor in determining survival as against a selfish individualism.

How inspiring and consoling is the fact that Nature is on the side of morality, that the part played by ethics in the evolution of man has been to favor those morally strong in the struggle for life.

And since the fate of a nation depends at last upon the character of the individuals composing it our double duty with reference to Darwinism on the moral plane is clear. Each one

of us counts in the upbuilding and developing of our country. Our privilege and duty it is to see to it that we are on Nature's side, that we count for temperance and purity, for unselfishness, civic patriotism and public spirit and to save not only our own souls but also the great nation of which we are a part.

THE RELIGION OF THE BODY.

N. H. Nesbitt.

A healthy, well-poised, spiritual and intellectual man or woman is the most superb of the works of Nature. Health is contagious. Health has a decidedly moral quality and is itself moral. By this I mean that a healthy body is, as a general rule, the indication of a healthy mind. It is far more our duty to eat moderately, to breathe properly, and to live part of one's life in the open air, blown by the winds, caressed by the sun, charmed and fascinated by the stars, than it is to believe in vicarious atonement. Health is inseparable from happiness. Bath houses have done as much as books to promote the civilization of mankind. The body is just as divine as the soul, just as mysterious, indestructible and sacred. The loving mother who every day and with her own hands, bathes her child and tucks him into bed sweet and fresh does more for his moral growth than the mother who makes her child kneel down and say a prayer and then puts him unwashed to bed. Unkempt men or women, careless or slovenly men or women, can not hope to win the smile of God until they dress up. The Lord covered three-fourths of the earth with water and then ordained an invisible machinery in the skies to pump it, harnessed the "sightless couriers" of the wind to the clouds, the water-carriers, and perpetually sends them to pour ablutions on towns and fields and animals and tramps. The vicious and dangerous quarters of cities are nearly always the filthy quarters. Where decaying matter and refuse are, vice germinates and spreads. Evil does not thrive so well where there is good ventilation, pure air, light and cleanliness. The use of water is one of the measures of civilization. One of the moral uses of the Sabbath day lies in the fact that it gives the only opportunity to thousands

who toil, to bathe and shave and put on their best clothes. These things in themselves constitute a moral process. They are better for the moral ends of life than the sacrament or the sunrise prayer meeting, or any imaginable number of prosy sermons. It is every woman's duty to be as beautiful as she can; it is every man's duty to keep himself, by dress and deportment, and by the thought that he thinketh in his heart, as attractive as possible. This is the evident intention of nature, which lessons she has taught us in a thousand ways.

Walt Whitman was the poet of the body, of good health, of sanity; he was the poet of human proportions and relations embracing all. Of all the modern poets he is the most inclusive; he "speaks the password primeval and gives the sign of democracy." He was not the poet of the club, or the clique, or the aristocracy, like Tennyson; he was not a maker of artificial flowers that are beautiful but which lack fragrance and the hint of life, as was Alexander Pope, he was the poet of the whole world. He in all the literature of man, is the one alone who hopes all things and believes all things. He uncovered in the presence of none, the lowest he did not scorn. He says indifferently and alike, "How are you, friend?" to the President at his reception, and he says, "How are you, brother?" to the man with the hoe. He says of the outcast "Not until the sun excludes you do I exclude you, not until the waters refuse to glisten for you, and the leaves to rustle for you, shall my word refuse to glisten and rustle for you." He treated man as nature treats man. He was as generous as the sun, ample as the sky, impartial as light. He embraced all as the horizon embraces all.

EDITORIAL.

JESUS AND OTHER MASTERS.

Once more we are called to register our unqualified disapproval of the pernicious practice of assigning to Jesus absolute superiority over all other teachers. All attempts to place him there are at best but mere feats of intellectual ath-

letics and involve unethical procedure. Certain it is that the modern ideal of humanity cannot be derived from Jesus alone, great as is the contribution he made to our conception of it. The Greek ideal, the Confucian, the Zoroastrian and each of the other historic ideals must be reckoned with in shaping the highest ideal of modern thought. It is easy enough to begin with this and then read Jesus into it. But our most reliable sources of information regarding him give us no warrant for the assumption that he was the embodiment of all the qualities possible to all men much less the perfect embodiment of these. A passage from one of the discourses of the late Mr. Chadwick is much to the point in this connection:

> Those who prefer to use language with a certain rhetorical looseness may speak of him as the perfect man, the ideal man, always prepared to say they did not mean anything definite when they are brought to book. In many a Unitarian church there sits some nice old Cerberus who likes to have his minister throw him these little sops. But the better way is to bring one's language into the closest possible conformity with one's thought, however Cerberus may bark.
>
> Within the limits of such conceptions of Jesus as are denoted by the phrases "perfect man" and "ideal man," it is almost as impossible to speak rationally and distinctly of his character as it is while regarding him as the Second Person in the Trinity. In either case, you have a monochromatic wash, when what you want is a palette of the most various colors. You have men considering what constitutes moral perfection and what constitutes the ideal man, and then substituting their conceptions for Jesus in a wholesale manner. You have a Jesus evolved from their inner consciousness, and not from the New Testament. And it is from the New Testament that we must evolve him if we are going to have any warrantable conception of his character.

ARE SECTS MULTIPLYING?

Our answer must be an unqualified yes. The actual tendency today is toward division rather than toward unity. Within the past twenty or thirty years how many religious organizations have sprung into existence, all the way from the "Salvation Army" to the "Church of Christ, Scientist." That these two sects are meeting a genuine need seems evident from their large and growing constituency. Yet both organizations have

already divided into several sects each; the former into "Volunteers," with varying sub-titles, and the latter into "Eddyites" and "non-Eddyites," including a dozen or more types, each differentiated from the rest by some peculiar appellation and idea, or in some cases by no name whatever, and no stated basis of fellowship. From the Orient have been imported within the same short time Theosophy, Behaism and Hindu Swamis, each adapted to Western ideas and each multiplying with marvelous rapidity. Here, too, as in the other sects, we see division after division created and organized, and the end is not yet, neither of the birth of sects nor of secessions. To many this divisive tendency is deplorable, and construed as a sign of the decay of faith. To us, on the contrary, it gives cause for rejoicing, and is a sign of spiritual life, and if of decay, then only the decay of a faith which has been outgrown and is steadily being superseded by the larger faith built on science and the reverent search for truth.

ARE WE A SECT OF TWO CHURCHES?

It has been said more than once that the free churches of Tacoma and Seattle are after all only a little sect, though calling themselves non-sectarian. If numbers were what makes a sect the criticism would be correct. But fewness has nothing whatever to do with it, only principle and purpose. These two societies are today in exactly the same position that the first two American colonies were in when they had ratified the constitution of 1787. At that time they two alone expressed in concrete reality the union proposed in the constitution and they had simply to wait for seven other colonies to act as they had done. When nine colonies had ratified the constitution then the nation, the Union, became fully realized. Meanwhile, however, the first two had done all they could to make the Union real. They imagined the Union of the United States already a fact and organized the two separate states in keeping with that ideal, harmonizing them perfectly with that greater whole of which they dreamed.

Similarly the Tacoma Free Church and the Seattle Society for Universal Religion have organized themselves in accordance

with a corresponding ideal in religion, a union of free churches of free individuals; a Universal Church of Mankind. So far as it lies in their power to realize that ideal they have done so and they know the ideal will not be fully realized until all other churches have taken the same stand. A little band of truth lovers, these two societies are trying the experiment of realizing a sublime ideal on a humble scale, subordinating themselves to that greater whole of which they dream, realizing that they are only a part and not the whole, only a leaf or branch and not the tree, merely an organ and not the organism itself. Though merely acorns, they yet trust that from them will rise at length a forest of oaks, that the tiny germs of democracy in religion which they have planted on the North Pacific coast may eventually prove to be the small beginnings of the Universal Church of Mankind.

When each one of the seven great religions abandons its sectarianism and confesses itself only a part and not the whole of religion, acknowledges that its Bible is only a part and not the whole of divine revelation in literature; that its Church or communion is only a part and not the whole of the true church; that its Founder is not the only light of the world, but rather one of a number of great luminaries in the sky of the spirit, each of whom is to be valued for his special gifts to mankind, then and then only will sectarianism be a thing of the past and the experiment tried on so small and humble a scale in the two little societies at Tacoma and Seattle be completely justified.

That is the meaning of the experiment being tried there and because of this principle and purpose at the heart of them the two churches cannot be said to be "another sect." Whenever a church or religious society thus subordinates itself to the Universal Church of mankind, as its higher whole and lives both for itself and for that higher ideal church which unites in one loving co-operative Brotherhood of Man all souls that would "live upward," there we see a non-sectarian society, be its membership small or large, numbered by units or by thousands.